

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN MARK VAN DEN HEUVEL,

Plaintiff,

v.

ADAM CLARK,

Defendant.

No. 2:23-cv-00708-KJM-DMC-P

ORDER

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by Eastern District of California local rules.

On July 10, 2024, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on the parties, and which contained notice that the parties may file objections within the time specified therein. No objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

1 Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the findings and
2 recommendations was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to
3 keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service
4 of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations filed July 10, 2024, ECF No. 18, are adopted
7 in full.
- 8 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution and failure to
9 comply with court rules and orders.
- 10 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment and close this file.

11 DATED: October 3, 2024.

12 
13 _____
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28